

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed December 8, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Final Office Action mailed December 8, 2008, claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application. In the Final Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102, hereinafter Bickmore) in view of Kindberg et al. (<http://www.hpl.hp.com/techreports/2000/HPL-2000-16.pdf>, hereinafter Kindberg).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends claims 1, 10, and 11, and adds new claim 15, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-8 and 10-15.

III. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Kindberg.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. As amended, claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently amended) A method for providing dynamic data detection from Web content information for a mobile device comprising the steps of:
receiving a URL from a user;
accessing a Web page identified by the URL;
parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page; wherein each of the one or more Web content data items comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity;
creating one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items; and*

displaying to the mobile device the one or more link indications for selection by a user, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of contact information of the Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication.

Parsing the currently accessed Web page

Claim 1, as amended, defines parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, *wherein each of the one or more Web content data items comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity.* Examples of types of Web content data items are telephone numbers, addresses, and emails. Applicants respectfully submit that these features of claim 1 are not disclosed by Bickmore and Kindberg.

It was alleged that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. Web content data being telephone numbers, addresses, and e-mails) is not recited in the claims, on page 8 of the Office action, last line, through page 9, top two lines. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include “contact information for a person or entity,” which encompasses telephone numbers, addresses, and e-mails.

Further, it was alleged that Bickmore discloses parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, in col. 3, lines 64-76 and col. 11, lines 60-67, on page 3 of the Office action. Although Bickmore discloses parsing the document to construct a parse tree representation of the document (col. 11, lines 60-63), Applicants respectfully submit that with the amendment to claim 1, Bickmore does not disclose parsing a Web page (document) to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, wherein each of the one or more Web content data items comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as in the embodiment defined by claim 1.

Creating one or more link indications

Claim 1, as amended, further defines *creating one or more link indications* that correspond to the one or more non-hyperlink *Web content data items*. It was alleged that Bickmore discloses this element of claim 1. However, with the amendment to claim 1, Bickmore does not disclose identifying non-hyperlink Web content data items, each of which comprises

text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as discussed above, and further does not disclose creating link indications that correspond to these Web content data items, as discussed below.

Bickmore discloses that for a document, each section header 104 is converted into a hypertext link, as shown in Fig. 1, and col. 8, lines 20-21. The section header 104, as disclosed in Bickmore, is a header in a document that sets apart a section of text 102. The Web content data items, as required by claim 1, on the other hand, each comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity. A section header, as disclosed in Bickmore, is not the same as text that is contact information. Thus, creating link indications for the sections headers, as disclosed in Bickmore, is not the same as creating one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, it was stated that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. link indications are provided for the Web content data items parsed from a Web page) is not recited in the rejected claim, on page 8 of the Office action, last two lines. The Applicants respectfully disagree, as this statement is embodied in the claim, and was used in Applicant's argument in the previous Reply to paraphrase two elements of the claim: parsing the currently accessed Web page...to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, and creating one or more link indications that correspond to the one more non-hyperlink Web content data items.

Displaying the one or more link indications

Claim 1, as amended, requires each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of *contact information of the* Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication. Examples of services related to types of Web content data items, are dialing a phone number, displaying a map, or sending an email. Applicants respectfully submit that these features of claim 1 are not disclosed by Bickmore and Kindberg.

It was alleged that the Applicants argue that the link indication is displayed by the mobile device to provide services such as dialing a phone number, displaying a map, or sending an e-mail, and that these limitations are not in the claim, on page 9 of the Office action, second

sentence. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include that “each service is related to a type of contact information of the Web content data item,” which encompasses dialing a phone number, displaying a map, or sending an e-mail.

Further, it was alleged that Kindberg discloses each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performs a service related to a type of *Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication*, on page 8 of the Office action, 19. With the amendment to claim 1, neither Kindberg nor Bickmore disclose that each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as in the embodiment defined by amended claim 1. It was stated that applicant correctly recognizes that Kindberg teaches that Veronica’s PDA electronically picks up URLs for pages about the city itself and places within it that she travels through - the railway station, a shopping district, and a café - and it present these to her as web links. However, Veronica’s PDA as disclosed in Kindberg does not use Web content data items, as required by amended claim 1, where *Web content data items* comprises *text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity*. Veronica’s PDA senses links, and she may select them as she travels. (p. 3, 2.1). In the embodiment as defined by claim 1, on the other hand, the link indications (web links) were created from *Web content data items*. In other words, the sensed web link as disclosed in Kindberg, is not the same as the link indication created from a Web content data item, where each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as in the embodiment defined by claim 1.

Further, it was alleged that Kindberg discloses each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication, on page 9 of the Office action. With the amendment to claim 1, neither Kindberg nor Bickmore disclose that each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as in the embodiment defined by amended claim 1. It was stated that the applicant correctly recognizes that Kindberg discloses that when Veronica calls up a Web page for Harry and clicks on a link marked “communicate,” that telephone rings, and the telephone application pops up on her PDA. (p. 3, 2.1). This “communicate” link is simply a link on a (Harry’s) Web page. Again, Veronica’s PDA, as disclosed in Kindberg, does not use Web content data items, as required by amended claim 1,

where each *Web content data item* comprises *text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity*. Thus, the “communicate” link found on a web page (Harry’s), as disclosed in Kindberg, is not the same as the link indication created from a Web content data item, where each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity, as in the embodiment defined by claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Kindberg and Bickmore fail to teach or suggest that parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, wherein each of the one or more Web content data items comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity; creating one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items; and each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of contact information of the Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication, as required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kindberg and Bickmore, and respectfully request reconsideration of the claim.

Claim 3

Claim 3 requires that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a telephone number. It was alleged that Applicants argued in the previous Reply that Kindberg fails to disclose “a link indication from a telephone number, which was parsed from a Web page,” and that the Examiner fails to find these wordings in claim 3, at the bottom of page 9 of the Office action. To clarify, this statement was made with reference to claim 1, which includes parsing the currently accessed Web page...to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items. In claim 3, one or more Web content data items comprises a telephone number.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Kindberg and Bickmore do not disclose Web content data items, where each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Bickmore and Kindberg fail to teach or suggest that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a telephone number, as required by claim 3. For at least this reason,

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 3 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore or Kindberg, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 5

Claim 5 requires that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a street address. As discussed above in reference to claim 1, Bickmore and Kindberg do not disclose Web content data items, where each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Bickmore and Kindberg fail to teach or suggest that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a street address, as required by claim 5. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 5 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore or Kindberg, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 requires that if one of the one or more Web content data items is a street address and the corresponding at least one link indication is activated, displaying to the mobile device the location of the street address on an online map. On page 6 of the Office action, the Examiner states that this is disclosed by Kindberg on p. 5 (and 6), 2.4. This section of Kindberg discloses location-specific web portals, but does not teach or suggest street addresses or online maps. Thus, Kindberg does not disclose displaying to the mobile device the location of the street address on an online map, as required by claim 6.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Bickmore and Kindberg fail to teach or suggest that if one of the one or more Web content data items is a street address and the corresponding at least one link indication is activated, displaying to the mobile device the location of the street address on an online map, as required by claim 6. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 6 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore or Kindberg, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 7

Claim 7 requires that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises an email address. As discussed above in reference to claim 1, Bickmore and Kindberg do not disclose Web content data items, where each Web content data item comprises text in the Web page that is contact information for one of a person and an entity. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Bickmore and Kindberg fail to teach or suggest that one of the one or more Web content data items comprises an email address, as required by claim 7. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 7 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore or Kindberg, taken alone or in combination, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is an independent method claims for providing a location on an online map of a street address associated with Web page information. The comments provided above with respect to claims 1, 5, and 6 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 10 has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 by the current Reply, to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 6, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore and Kindberg, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is an independent method claim for initiating an email for an email address associated with Web page information. The comments provided above with respect to claims 1 and 7 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 11 has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 by the current Reply, to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claims 1 and 7, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Bickmore and Kindberg, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 12-14

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 12-14 depend from and include all of the features of claims 1, 10, and 11, as described above. Claims 2, 4, 8, and 12-14 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Additional Amendments

Claim 15 has been newly added by the present Response. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added in new claim 15. Applicants respectfully request that new claim 15 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2009

By: /Julie Daniels Missud/

Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910